

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/582,659	04/24/2007	Joseph Grez	US03 0500 US2	6670		
24738 PHILIPS INTE	7590 08/27/200 ELLECTUAL PROPER	EXAM	EXAMINER			
PO BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510-8001			PATEL, Y	PATEL, YOGESH P		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
		3732				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			08/27/2009	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/582,659 GREZ, JOSEPH Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit

		YOGESH PATEL	3732				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING SINCE HERE IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING SINCE HERE IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING SINCE SINCE IN THE SINCE IS SINCE IN THE SINCE IS SINCE SINCE IS SINCE IS SINCE IS SINCE IS SINCE IS SINCE IS SINCE FROM IT SINCE IS SINCE IS SINCE IS SINCE IS SINCE IS SINCE THE SINCE IS SINCE IN SINCE IS SINCE IS SINCE IN SINCE IS SINCE IN SINCE IS SINCE IN SINCE IS SINCE IN SINCE IN SINCE IS SINCE IN SINC	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 Ju</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		e merits is			
.	· ·	s parte dayle, 1000 old 11, 11	00.0.2.0.				
	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1 and 3-12 is/are pending in the applida) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1.3-12 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)□ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list-	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)						
_	1) N Natice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Intentiew Summary (PTO-413)						

Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F 3) Information Disclosure Statemsnt(s)(FTOISECS)	PTO-948) Paper I	w Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	
S. Patent and Trademark Office		B

Application/Control Number: 10/582,659

Art Unit: 3732

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/17/2009 has been entered.

Specification

The Abstract submitted on 06/17/2009 is entered

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo (2003/0077107) in view of Meyer et al. (4,236,651) in view of either Gjertsen et al. (4,783,312) or Flick et al. (6,295,427).

Art Unit: 3732

Kuo discloses a stem portion for a toothbrush including a stem body 31(fig. 3b-3c and 6a-b) having an outer and inner surface which defies the longitudinal opening 31, a core member 33 configured to fit within the stem body opening. Kuo fails to disclose grooves as claimed.

Meyer teaches a core member (fig. 6) having longitudinal grooves 33a for throughflow channel. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Kuo by providing multiple channel by grooves as taught by Meyer for providing fluid/dentifrice through multiple ports into the bristles of the toothbrush. Note that neither Kuo or Meyer disclose a stem body having grooves, however it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Kuo by providing grooves that corresponds to groove of Meyer so that circular channel can be formed, if one desires do so. For example, if one desire to have a square longitudinal channel, then one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made would realize to create semi square shape groove (as oppose to semi circular groove of Meyer) on the core member and the same to the stem body so that a square shaped channel could be achieved. Further, Kuo discloses fluid pathways and ribs and the stem body includes slot for locking purposes. Kuo is silent about the two extending ribs are being welded to the stem body. However, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to connect two mechanical members by welding or other means since applicant has not disclosed that this solves any stated problem or is anything more than one of numerous shapes or configuration a Application/Control Number: 10/582,659

Art Unit: 3732

person of ordinary skill in the art would find obvious for the purpose of providing an obliquely inclined housing. In re Dailey and Eilers, 149 USPQ 47 (1966).

In response to Applicant's arguments in the response filed on 06/17/03 that mating grooves forming a channel is not shown in either Kuo or Meyer. The Examiner points to Flick where two base members having groove are aligned to create a passage/channel (fig. 3A-3B, see elements 73, 56, 64, 66). Further, Gjertsen shows rods 21 (fig. 5) having semi oval-shaped grooves 22 which are aligned to form a channel/passage. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Kuo by providing grooves that corresponds to groove of Meyer so that circular channel can be formed, if one desires do so for the purpose of passing fluids/paste thru the channel.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 06/17/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant arguments regarding mating grooves are addressed above. Further, the argument regarding function language (e.g. for delivery of fluids to the bristle plate), Kuo shows channel delivering fluid to the bristles in figure 4D. In addition, the statement of intended use/functional statements, they do not impose any structural limitations on the claims distinguishable over the Kuo/Meyer which is capable of being used as claimed if one so desires to do so. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior

Art Unit: 3732

art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOGESH PATEL whose telephone number is (571)270-3646. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cris Rodriguez can be reached on 571-272-4964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/YOGESH PATEL/ Examiner, Art Unit 3732

/Ralph A. Lewis/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3732